

Minutes of the
Edina Park Board
April 12, 2011
Edina City Hall, Council Chambers

MEMBERS PRESENT: Bill Lough, Todd Fronek, Joseph Hulbert, Dan Peterson, Randy Meyer, Felix Pronove, Austin Dummer

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ellen Jones, Louise Segreto, Keeya Steel, David Deeds

STAFF PRESENT: John Keprios, Ed MacHolda, Janet Canton, Scott Neal, Ann Kattreh, Susie Miller

I. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Dan Peterson MOVED TO APPROVE THE MARCH 8, 2011 PARK BOARD MINUTES. Randy Meyer SECONDED THE MOTION. MINUTES APPROVED.

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. Park Board Bylaws - Mr. Hulbert stated that in the packet Mr. Keprios provided them some sample bylaws from other commissions. He noted that he has also been in touch with the chair of the Edina Transportation Commission (ETC) and as he understands it other commissions are working on their bylaws as well. Mr. Hulbert indicated that one consideration he thought merited some discussion was he thinks there needs to be some consistency in the bylaws for the sake of current and future staff. Mr. Hulbert made copies of the ETC's bylaws and handed it out to the Park Board members. He stated that perhaps over the course of the next month they could highlight some of the things they liked from the samples and they could discuss it at their next meeting.

Mr. Meyer stated that obviously he knows what bylaws are for but asked for a little more background of what the goal is, what's the dynamic they are trying to accomplish? Mr. Keprios replied that as you look at the sample bylaws from other commissions you will notice that there really are no two the same. He indicated that the

draft he put together is a starting point for the Park Board to review and that he tried to keep it simple and to the point without getting into a lot of details like the Planning Commission has done. He explained that it's really the order of business that defines what the roles are of the Chair, Vice-Chair and officers as well as it references a little bit about the City Code and how that applies to the Park Board. He noted that he tried to capture some of the mission duties and function of the Park Board in its most basic form. Mr. Keprios pointed out that the other thing he tried to incorporate is addressing what constitutes a quorum; the Park Board has twelve members of which two of those are non-voting members and asked does that mean if only five voting members are present should that really be considered a quorum. He stated that he noticed with some of the other commissions, just to be consistent, he thought it would make some sense for the Park Board to consider having six voting members required to constitute a quorum and so that is something for the Park Board to consider. He added that it also spells out the duties that it will be staff's job to work with the chair to come up with agendas as well as it makes reference to the ability to form sub-committees and work groups so they don't have to go back to the City Council each time, it gives the chair the authority to appoint people to those committees. He noted that it also references Roberts Rules of Order for parliamentary procedure. Mr. Keprios indicated that he tried to capture all of it in a simplistic form and not to get too lengthy because in his view it's better to keep it short and sweet but he is certainly open to any and all ideas. He noted that he likes the idea of consistency but that clearly there are no two commissions that are the same. He commented that the City Council may end up directing all of the commissions to go back and try to fit them into more of a boiler plate type.

Mr. Fronek indicated that one thing he would recommend including is what constitutes a formal recommendation from the Park Board. He noted being there are ten voting members would they need six votes to pass something or simple majority. He stated that he thinks there needs to be some sort of bylaw in there that says this will constitute a formal recommendation from the Park Board. Mr. Keprios replied he will include that language in there but would assume it would be a simple majority.

Mr. Meyer indicated one thought he had, which he thinks may be especially helpful for outsiders, is for there to be some sort of understanding of the reporting sequence and how that process works. He noted this way if there is someone on an athletic association who wants to know who they need to talk to about something they will know what the organizational structure is because sometime he thinks it's not perfectly clear. He also asked about the Art Center that they are separate from the Park Board or still sort of part of them. Mr. Keprios replied that for clarification the Art Center Board, which hasn't always been separate of the Park Board, are on their own and do report directly to the City Council, they are not subordinate to the Park Board; they make recommendations directly to the City Council. He noted that all 14 athletic associations are independently incorporated under the Secretary of State of Minnesota. He noted that they have a defined relationship and expectations of the athletic associations which some are mandatory and some are on the recommendation side but those policies have been in

place and were created by the Youth Sports Task Force which was approved by the Park Board and accepted by the City Council. Mr. Meyer asked where is that documentation because as an outsider does he have access to go and find that because he thinks it's an important issue and people should be able to have that transparency to know where to look and how to understand it. Mr. Keprios replied that he would happy to put that information online.

Mr. Peterson asked if the Senior Center is part of the Park Board to which Mr. Keprios replied absolutely. Mr. Peterson stated in his four years as a Park Board member the Senior Center has never been an agenda item and asked if they should be or is there something they need to know about. Mr. Keprios replied that when the time is appropriate the Senior Center will be an agenda item. He noted that there is advisory group for Susan Weigle, Director of the Senior Center, to give her some guidance on programming. He indicated that the Senior Center is much like their enterprise facilities, although it's not specifically an enterprise facility but there are fees and charges issues that come up and if there were to be programming issues or other questions that come up it would be of the Park Board nature and would belong at a Park Board meeting.

Mr. Peterson suggested that the Park Board take a look at the draft Mr. Keprios put together and e-mail him any recommended changes and at the next meeting they can approve it with all of the changes. Mr. Hulbert replied he thinks that is a good idea and asked if that's a motion.

Mr. Lough stated before they get to a motion he has a question, wasn't the precipitating event to produce these bylaws due to the fact that we want to be able to establish committees and currently we have no authority to do that? Mr. Keprios replied that is correct; however, that has changed because in February of this year the City Council passed a new ordinance to their city code that demands that all of advisory boards and commissions come up with bylaws. Mr. Keprios indicated that he wrongfully assumed since the Park Board was formed back in the 1950s that they had bylaws somewhere but he was mistaken. He noted there is a document named Articles of Function created by the Park Board years ago but the Park Board apparently never created bylaws. Therefore, until the Park Board creates bylaws that are approved by the City Council, the Park Board will need to go back to the City Council and ask for their permission to form additional committees.

Mr. Hulbert stated so Dan if that was a motion I would second that motion. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

B. Establish Committees – Mr. Hulbert stated that he thought there were three committees approved: facility users fee committee; donations policy and naming park facilities committee; and a subcommittee to review the responses to the Braemar Golf Course RFP. He noted that he believes Mr. Fronek, Ms. Segreto, as well as himself volunteered to be a part of the Braemar committee. He indicated that if anyone would like to be a part of the other two subcommittees to let Mr. Keprios or him know. He added that Ms. Jones has expressed an interest in being part of the donations and naming committee.

Mr. Peterson asked if the City Council has a naming policy that the Park Board should know about to which Mr. Keprios replied they do not have a policy in place. Mr. Peterson asked Mr. Keprios if in all of the years he has worked for the city has the Park Board been asked for advice. Mr. Keprios replied that he has seen a couple of times where the Park Board has recommended to the City Council to consider a naming policy before naming anything further. He noted that in all cases the City Council has sent back the message that at this time they are not interested in a naming policy, that it is their decision, and that it will be done on a case by case basis. Mr. Keprios pointed out that does not mean the Park Board can't recommend one and see what happens.

Mr. Peterson explained the reason he asks is because he sent an e-mail to one or two council members when Mr. Valliere retired with a suggestion but they chose to take a different avenue. He noted that he thinks for them to spend a lot of time trying to adopt a policy that may or may not be used, probably is not a good use of staff time and member time.

Mr. Meyer indicated that he thinks the emphasis from their workshop last year regarding donations and how they accept them was the major part of it and feels naming of facilities was a minor part of it. He noted that it's his understanding that when they accept a gift what are the terms they are accepting them under and what is the obligation of the City once they accept those gifts? He stated that he thinks the framing of that is really the critical component. Mr. Fronek commented that he echoes that sentiment and thinks that at their workshop with the City Council it was Council Member Swenson who said she would be interested in some sort of donation policy or some sort of list like they talked about at their meeting. For example, if you donate \$500.00 you will get this, etc., etc.

Mr. Fronek stated that he thinks it would be helpful to have a little bit clearer definition for what each of the subcommittees would be doing, what the goals would be. Mr. Meyer indicated that these committees are not necessarily ongoing committees. Therefore he thinks it's important that everyone understands there is an

objective with these committees and once that objective is accomplished these committees are disbanded effectively until something else may come up in the future.

Mr. Hulbert stated regarding the fee related committee he thinks they may want to try to define it a little bit more. Mr. Fronek commented that it's his understanding that the subcommittee has already been approved by the City Council. He noted that he really thinks it would help the members if first they know what level of commitment and second what duties and scope are they looking at in working on these committees. He asked for the fees if they are looking at the number that's being used and then figure out what the total expenses are for taking care of the fields and then here is the user fee that goes towards those fields and then try to figure out the correct number. Mr. Hulbert replied when they were in the work session he thought they were being clearly asked to review the athletic association fees in relation to each association to the facilities so that they are getting the appropriate amount. He noted should they be getting the flat fee of \$9.00 from all of the associations or should they be looking at the associations separately. He stated that he thought there was some discussion in regards to soccer vs. baseball vs. softball and what it is costing the city to maintain those fields. He indicated he thinks that was the task they were asked to get into. Mr. Hulbert commented that regarding the donations and naming policies he thinks the City Council directed the Park Board to discuss naming policies and noted that last month they received an e-mail from Gene Persha, which was in the packet, regarding a naming policy so perhaps Mr. Persha could attend one of those meetings when that topic is being discussed.

Mr. Hulbert indicated that he didn't think they needed to establish goals necessarily right here tonight for what they are trying to accomplish with the committees. He noted that he thinks right now they just need to know if there are people who want to donate their time and be on a subgroup with three or four members and staff. He stated that these meetings would not be on camera; however, he thinks it would be a good idea to keep minutes of the meetings.

Mr. Lough stated as he recalls the donations policy and naming committee came out of the fact that we have a donations policy but there was a degree of discomfort with what exactly happens when someone makes a contribution to a park. He indicated that he thinks the initial focus was specifically on parks and that when someone makes a donation how is it acknowledged. He noted that if that acknowledgment includes the possibility of naming some part of a park, a piece of equipment, a tree or whatever it might be that we would be better served to have a specific power to consider a specific policy that would cover all of these areas. Mr. Lough pointed out as a separate issue he thinks naming something in the park would be absent the donation component because they really had not discussed that as a second issue but he thinks it was acknowledged as being a second issue. He commented that he thinks when most of them went into the

work session they felt they did need to consider some sort of a better developed policy around donations and naming something in a park or a park around that donation.

Mr. Lough indicated that when asked to approve fees each year for the upcoming year he was working in somewhat of a vacuum in that he did not understand nor was he in possession of the history of how the fees had originally been set up. He noted that it seemed as though they were being asked to approve them on an incremental or exceptional basis and therefore at this point feels the need to have an overall review of facility user fees, how they establish them and why they are what they are as well as whether or not they need to make some basic or just a simple change to the way in which those fees are established. He pointed out that at the very least it would serve as an educational basis for the members of the board who serve on that committee so that they will then be in a better position to better share that information with other members of the Park Board. He commented that he's not even sure a facility user fee is the best way to put it but rather revenues overall because there is more that goes into revenues than just fees.

Mr. Peterson replied that he would like to push for an understanding of revenues and agrees with Mr. Lough that it is more than just fees. He pointed out that he thinks there should be an incubator of new ventures and noted that one of the things that has been happening around the country is they make golf balls that have lights and people are playing night golf. He commented they have two nine-hole golf courses where it might be a good place to try it.

Mr. Meyer stated that he thinks by their next meeting they should know what board members are on what subcommittees. He noted that by the following month they could schedule a committee meeting where they come back and report some initial findings or at least gauge the board with the scope of what the individual committees are targeting. He indicated that he would like some feedback from Mr. Keprios whether or not that what they are pushing for as far as information and work load is reasonable for staff to accomplish within the time frame they are looking at.

C. Veterans Memorial Committee – Mr. Hulbert informed the Park Board that if anyone is interested in serving on the Veterans Memorial Committee to let Mr. Keprios know. He noted that he did have a discussion with Mr. Keprios as to whether or not the Park Board member would be a voting member or non-voting member and asked if anyone had a feeling on that, one way or the other.

D. Edinborough Park Consultant – Mr. Hulbert indicated that hiring a consultant for Edinborough Park is something that came up in the work session they had with the City Council and asked if anyone had thoughts and/or recollects that discussion. Mr. Lough responded that it seemed at that time there was a strong feeling from a number of the members of the City Council who think that the situation is complex enough and impactful size wise, revenues and costs that a consultant would be warranted, that is his recollection of what happened. Mr. Keprios commented that the City Council, although they haven't given them the directive to do this, seems to have a strong interest and he thinks it would be appropriate for the Park Board to make a formal recommendation. He pointed out that staff will work on an RFP and bring that back to the May Park Board meeting to look over and make any changes. He noted that to expedite the process they could even do it via e-mail so that hopefully there will be a final draft by the May meeting and then vote for a recommendation on to the City Council for them to approve and move the project forward. Mr. Keprios stated it's a complex issue but that Edinborough has a marvelous staff team and that he will need to rely heavily on Ms. Kattreh and Ms. Miller for recommendations and help write the RFP.

Mr. Meyer noted that what he struggles with, and obviously the RFP is going to cover this scope, is somehow they need to figure out how they are going to turn that space into effective use for the citizens of Edina. He noted that he also thinks they need to make sure there is some path to break even somewhere in the future and if not what are the alternatives for that space.

Mr. Lough indicated that he has specifically reviewed the business plan for Edinborough Park. He asked Mr. Keprios if staff takes a crack at this RFP along the lines that the City Council and Park Board members are talking about; is there any other documentation you could share with the Park Board by e-mail along with the RFP that would help them sort of understand why you are doing it or is the business plan enough. Mr. Keprios replied that he will be happy to share any other information that the Park Board is going to need to develop an intelligent RFP. He noted that Mr. Meyer is right; it becomes also a philosophical decision. He noted that most community centers throughout Minnesota and the United States typically don't make money and it is very difficult to break even unless you have something unique and different. He commented that it might be optimistic to think they are going to make it 100% but staff will come forward with an RFP that will spell out at least from a staff standpoint and what they are hearing from the City Council on the business plan option of what that philosophy should be and what the goal should be and how to get there. He pointed out it just can't be an adjustment to the play equipment; they need to think of a bigger picture, maybe items they haven't even thought of and that is what he is hoping to capture from a study.

E. Community Advisory Team Representative – Mr. Hulbert informed the Park Board that Ms. Jones had been serving as Park Board's representative to the CAT group for the

Grandview redevelopment area and noted that her one year term is up, so if anybody would like to volunteer to serve on that group to let Mr. Keprios know. Mr. Keprios noted that Ms. Jones did tell him that she was 50/50 on being willing to continue to serve in that capacity if there is no interest from another member to take on phase two. Mr. Peterson replied that they should thank Ms. Jones and since she did such a good job MOVED THAT SHE DO A SECOND TERM. Joseph Hulbert SECONDED THE MOTION. Mr. Hulbert asked Mr. Keprios to send Ms. Jones an e-mail to inform her of the decision.

F. Move June Park Board Meeting to Monday, June 13, 2011 – Mr. Hulbert noted that their June meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, June 14th which is actually the same evening as Edina's commencement and asked the Park Board if they would be okay with moving the meeting to Monday, June 13th. Todd Fronek MOVED TO CHANGE THE PARK BOARD MEETING TO JUNE 13th. Joseph Hulbert SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

III. OLD BUSINESS

A. Braemar Golf Course Clubhouse Consultant RFP – Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that he did incorporate Ms. Jones suggestions into the RFP draft that was in the packet. He noted that he is not suggesting that they all should be added or should not be added but that Ms. Jones suggestions are marked in red.

Mr. Peterson stated that maybe they could add two open ended questions to the consultant. He noted that the first question would be "What is going on in the world of golf, is it a temporary thing that's related to the economy or is there more to it that they need to know?" Secondly, he would like to know what creative programming have other municipality or publicly owned golf courses done to increase users. Mr. Hulbert replied that he likes those questions as well as Ms. Jones suggestions.

Mr. Fronek indicated that he likes Ms. Jones additions and thinks Mr. Keprios did a great job coming forth with the RFP in the first place. He noted that he thinks Mr. Peterson's number two amendment will be found in the market analysis compared to other courses within the Twin Cities. However, he definitely thinks they should get their take on what is going to happen to golf in the future.

Mr. Lough stated that he agrees with the additions Ms. Jones has made that are marked in red; however, he might work on the wording a little bit. He noted that he also

agrees with what Mr. Peterson is talking about in terms of asking the global questions of golf as a sport, public golf courses and where that is going in the future. Mr. Lough indicated that he would like to add two very specific additions to the scope of the study. He commented they have the number of full and part-time management staff positions but would also ask them to identify the core competencies for each of those positions and the performance measures for those positions. Mr. Hulbert asked Mr. Lough to explain a little bit more what it is he is looking for. Mr. Lough responded the consultants must know something about position specifications in terms of the competencies of the incumbents, what you would like them to be in terms of performance measures and how you know whether or not the jobs are being performed. He noted that then it is up to city management to determine how to implement those specific position requirements when it comes to individuals. Mr. Hulbert stated that he thinks that may be getting into the area of personnel management and asked Scott Neal, City Manager, how he feels about that. Mr. Neal replied that he understands the desire to see that kind of information and from a management standpoint they would be interested in obtaining that information. However, he noted, that to include that so specifically into the RFP may not be the direction you want to go. He explained that he thinks it presumes a direction that they've not made a decision about and that is the future mode of operations which may or may not be employees, it may be a combination of vendors and employees and technology. He stated that they haven't looked at what the best mode of operations is going to be for whatever the proposal is going to be in the future. Mr. Neal noted that he thinks if the Park Board and City Council make a decision about what kind of RFP and what kind of consultant to hire that at the end of the process when they get the proposal back to them that requires capital improvements or a change in the way that the golf course operates he thinks that at that point it would be best to look at how are we going to implement the recommended changes that we see. He commented that at this point that information may not be as relevant as it would down the line. Mr. Hulbert asked looking at it a different way what if Mr. Lough is looking for a golf course like Braemar would it require these types of positions with employees with these specific skill sets but not make comments about any of the employees that are there. Mr. Neal replied you may be able to get some other ideas from some other comparable public courses on staffing levels and how they perform in terms of how we perform and there may be some metrics in terms of staff per 100,000 rounds, are there some staffing ratios like that that we see in other parts of city government; police staffing, fire staffing planning staffing, etc., so staffing ratios would be something that they would be interested in. He commented that to presume an operating model at this stage of what could be a really transformative change in the golf course now may not be the right time to do that.

Mr. Neal pointed out that he thinks with what you've discussed and with what Ms. Jones has suggested he thinks they can work within. He commented that they need to remember that all they are doing with this is trying to attract a certain kind of consultant and he thinks this will do it.

Mr. Peterson asked do you want a motion to go ahead then as it's written and amended. Mr. Hulbert replied he wants to make sure that we get something in there that Mr. Lough likes to address what you were concerned with are you okay if we just go with Ellen's additions, Dan's additions. Mr. Lough replied yes, he is okay if they go ahead with it as it's written.

Mr. Peterson stated MOVED TO ADOPT AGAIN. Randy Meyer SECONDED THE MOTION. Mr. Keprios asked your motion included the two you wanted to add to which Mr. Peterson replied yes. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY WITH THE TWO ADDITIONS.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENTS

A. Braemar Men's Club - Rick Windham, 6233 Belmore Lane, informed the Park Board that he is president of the Braemar Men's Club and that he would like to invite the Park Board to attend their Spring Scramble on May 19th. He noted that it's a great way to see how the members of Braemar use the golf course. He commented that the Men's Club will be picking up the expense of the day. He added that even if you don't play golf you are still invited to attend the evening dinner. He noted that Mr. Keprios is also invited.

Mr. Meyer asked who is Ed White, it's the called the "Ed White Shootout". Mr. Windham replied that Ed White was a member of the Braemar Men's Club who has been remembered upon his death as a superb member who did a lot for them over the years. He noted that every year there is a participation award given in honor of Ed White.

V. UPDATES FROM STAFF

A. Braemar Golf Course – Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that all 45 holes of golf are open for business and the driving range is stacked about four or five deep so they are in full swing.

B. Veteran's Memorial Committee – Mr. Keprios informed the Park Board that the Veteran's Memorial Committee is very excited to see the first drafts of concepts that the architect is coming forward with at their April meeting.

VI. PARK BOARD COMMENTS

A. Rosland Park – Mr. Hulbert stated that he knows they once talked about the sidewalk that runs along 66th Street at Cornelia Park. He asked Mr. Keprios is that parkland where the sidewalk is or is that road right-of-way. Mr. Keprios replied he considers it both because it is part of the path that circles Rosland Park and is the only part of that pathway that goes around the north basin where they allow bicycles because it is wide enough and there are no clear view issues. He pointed out that several years ago

they eliminated bicycle use around the lake portion because it isn't safe and they don't have the real estate to widen it to make it safer for a second path. He stated again that it's really both because he considers it part of the park because they have it listed as one of their designated pathways. Mr. Hulbert explained that the reason he asks is because a lot of kids ride their bikes to get to the pool and when they are going eastbound on 66th on the sidewalk there are cars coming in the opposite direction on 66th at approximately 45 mph and he is concerned that a kid may fall off their bike and he thought it might help if there could be some type of barrier. He noted there is a barrier to keep people from falling into the lake but if a child were to fall off their bike they are going to fall right into oncoming traffic on 66th Street. He stated there are a lot of people that do use that sidewalk so he was wondering if they might ever talk about redoing the paths around 66th Street. He commented that maybe they could construct some sort of barrier to protect children from vehicles. Mr. Keprios replied that he thinks that would be an area to discuss with the City Engineer, Wayne Houle. Mr. Keprios commented that he still thinks they are safer than on a bike lane which is right on the street. He added that they also need to see whether there is room or if it's appropriate to put up a barrier because depending on how close you want it to the curb it may interfere with snowplowing so there are other issues to consider. Mr. Keprios stated that he will pass that suggestion along to Mr. Houle and have him take a look at it.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:05 p.m.